

REMARKS

The application now contains claims 1-18. Claims 1 and 3 have been currently amended, and claims 17 and 18 have been added to claim features of the invention, as originally disclosed, that are not claimed. Claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over the possibility that the elements do not overlap. This change is not made in response to the art cited by the Examiner, but rather by other art brought to the Examiner's attention. Claim 3, which was indicated by the Examiner as being patentable is placed in independent form.

The Examiner has indicated that an abstract on a separate page is required. An abstract on a separate page is not required in national stage PCT applications (see MPEP §1893.03(e)). As indicated in the last paragraph of the section titled "THE PAMPHLET", the abstract printed on the front page of the pamphlet is used in a US Patent that results from the application and it is improper to require an abstract on a separate piece of paper. Withdrawal of the requirement is respectfully requested.

As is clear from MPEP §608.01(n) I A *Acceptable Dependent Claim Wording*, the word "one" does not have to appear in the claim to make the wording proper. See, for example, the ninth example, viz: "Claim 10. A gadget as in any of claims 1-3 or 7-9, in which---" which uses the exact wording as in the present claims.

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Liguori, U.S. No. Patent 5,912,672. Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liguori. Claim 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liguori, in view of Scarpetti, U.S. Patent No. 5,764,248. Claims 7 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liguori, in view of Morikawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,136,688. All of the rejected claims are dependent on claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Liguori does not provide a *prima facie* case of anticipation for the reasons given below and that, for the same reason, Liguori alone or in combination, does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claim 1, as originally constituted and after amendment requires that "the data from the portion of one element in a band is completely read prior reading data corresponding to the portion of the second element in the band". In Liguori (as in WO 95/02224, described on page 1 of the application) the band is written line by line, with the portion of each object that is on the line being written in accordance with the level of the particular object. This is clearly indicated in Liguori at col. 12, lines 56 to 65 and also at col. 4, lines 21-26 and lines 50-56; col. 8, line 50 and lines 58-65; col. 12, lines 4-15 and in many other places. Determining the splines of the edges is used to determine which portions of which lines are to be printed (see for example col. 6, lines 39-

43; col. 8, lines 8-18; and many others. These are only representative examples and the patent as a whole does not allow for any other understanding.

In any event, it is eminently clear that here is no teaching of "the data from the portion of one element in a band is completely read prior reading data corresponding to the portion of the second element in the band" as required by claim 1.


The portion of the reference specifically cited by the Examiner with respect to this limitation deals with another issue altogether, namely the other characteristics of the object other than the pixel data itself. It is noted that the information stored (as indicated in col. 9, lines 1-5) refers to information that is characteristic of the *entire* layer and not of the image values contained in the layer.

Applicants wish to point out that the present application is a U.S. National Phase of PCT Application No. PCT/IL97/00319, filed on September 30, 1997, of which *no earlier priority is claimed*. In light of this, any document is needed to establish priority.

Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over the cited art. Notice to this effect is respectfully awaited. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Dr. Paul Fenster at 1 (877) 428-5468. Please note that this is a direct *toll free* number in the US that is answered in the undersigned's Israel office. Israel is 7 hours ahead of Washington.

In the event that the Examiner continues his rejections under the art cited, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide reasoning as to motivation for combining and how, technically, based on the references a combination is possible and obvious in order to produce the claimed invention.

Respectfully submitted,
Gideon AMIR, et al.



Paul Fenster
Reg. No. 33,877

December 29, 2003
William H. Dippert, Esq.
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650